



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b2227408x>

HOMŒOPATHY.



AN ATTEMPT TO STATE THE QUESTION WITH FAIRNESS,
AND TO ANALYZE THE RELATIVE MERITS OF THE
NEW AND OLD SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE.

BY

GEORGE WYLD, M.D.

PHYSICIAN TO THE HAHNEMANN HOSPITAL.

LONDON:

JOHN WALKER, 61, CONDUIT STREET, REGENT STREET.
SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL, STATIONERS' HALL COURT.

1853.

LONDON :
KNIGHT AND SON, PRINTERS, CLIFTONWELL CLOST

P R E F A C E.

THE present Pamphlet has been written with an anxious endeavour to state the question of Homœopathy with fairness, divested of an indiscriminate adulation on the one side, and of a mere unthinking opposition on the other. Homœopathy I most firmly believe to be the greatest advance ever made in medicine as a healing art, and Hahnemann, its founder, destined to affect the medical world for good to a far greater degree than any other writer on medicine who ever lived. Still Hahnemann, in his great work “The Organon of Medicine,” is often evidently absurd and extravagant; while Homœopathy, in its present condition, is far from being that ultimate perfection of all *healing knowledge* which every benevolent and scientific mind must for ever long for. I have endeavoured to write with all candour, and with every respect towards the practitioners of the old school, many of whom I am proud to number among my most honoured friends. For myself, I most anxiously desire the progress of medicine, not only as a professional study, but as a most noble and beneficent art and science, which all admixtures of personality must disgrace. I desire to find out and to propagate truth most ardently; but I desire to propagate this truth, not with the sword, but in peace.

GEORGE WYLD.

11, RUSSELL SQUARE,
January, 1853.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
On Man as a Being liable to Disease and Death	1
The History of Medicine, and its results	1
Hahnemann, his theory of Disease and Cure, and his Character	9
The opposition Homœopathy has met with is consistent with the history of opinion	13
Arguments in favour of the Infinitesimal Dose	17
Arguments in favour of the law <i>Similia Similibus Curantur</i>	22
Arguments against both the theory and practice of the Old School . .	26
Advantages of Homœopathy stated, and its superiority demonstrated by statistics	30
Analysis of the relative merits of the New and Old Schools	35
The extension of Homœopathy, and the probable effect this will have on the Profession	40
Conclusion	45

HOMŒOPATHY.

MAN, although the highest creation of God upon this earth, and although in “form and moving he is express and admirable, and noble in reason, and infinite in faculties, the paragon of animals, in action like an angel, and in apprehension like a god,” is still ever liable to disease, to decay, and to death. Of the *near* and *remote* causes of disease, decay, and death we know many things ; but of the *ultimate* or essential causes we know as little as of the nature of mind and the cause of life—that is, we know nothing. But although disease, or at least decay and inevitable death are the lot of all men, yet to alleviate pain, to heal disease, and to prolong human life, has been the intense desire of men in all ages of the world’s history.

In the very earliest records of mankind, we learn that the healing powers were sought for, not from physicians, but from “the Lord ;” and the means employed were the prayers of the patient or of the priest, offered up either at home or in the temple. This method, indeed, if it could be followed with a perfect *faith*, would be the ultimate perfection of all medicine, and was in truth the only means employed by Him who was the “Great Physician,” and the Healer of the *bodies* as well as the souls of men. But this perfect fulness of faith not being generally attainable, “men sought out many inventions” in the healing art ; and, as experience was increased, so were the number of ascertained medicinal substances acting on the bodies of men in disease multiplied. The *discovery* of these healing substances was said, among the heathen, to be due sometimes to dreams, at other times to the teachings of Esculapius, the god of the healing art ; and *recipes* founded on these substances were

hung up in the Esculapian temples,—for now medicine was entirely empirical, that is, founded wholly upon such specifics as *experience* had proved.

It is highly probable that medicine had to a considerable extent become systematized among the Egyptians, the Hindoos, and the Chinese, at a period long anterior to the days of the Greeks ; but, as far as European medicine is concerned, Hippocrates, who flourished about 400 years before Christ, is the founder of what is called systematized, or “ rational medicine.” Up to the days of Hahnemann medicine continued to be practised almost entirely upon the teachings of Hippocrates, or rather upon the teachings of Galen, who lived A.D. 131; and who, founding his system upon that of Hippocrates, made also additions of his own, and from these, and the accumulated writings of his predecessors, founded what was called the “ Galenic ” or “ Eclectic System of Rational Medicine.”

Between the days of Galen and Hahnemann many great men arose in medicine, such as Paracelsus, Haller, Harvey, Sydenham, Jenner, and Cullen : of these, Harvey, by his discovery of the circulation of the blood, added more to physiology than any other man who ever lived. Jenner’s discovery of the protective powers of vaccination is undoubtedly the most important *individual* discovery pathology has ever made ; while Paracelsus, probably a greater genius than either Harvey or Jenner, stimulated the profession to the study of chemistry, and added greatly to the resources of the *Materia Medica*. Still, great as are the several discoveries of these great men, none of them ever exercised any very lasting influence on the *practice* of healing, which in almost all that it differed from the practice of Hippocrates, differed only for the worse ; for while Hippocrates laid the greatest possible stress upon the influence of the *Vis Medicatrix Naturæ*, and strictly inculcated the practice of all those hygienic, gymnastic, and other methods for strengthening the vital force, such as bathing, temperance, occasional abstinence, exercise, and the right conduct of the mind, his followers more and more disregarded these means ; and trusting less and less to the powers of nature, and more and more to their pernicious

medication, still further celebrated the praises of an “heroic treatment,” until at last the practice of blood-letting and other heroics had attained to a pitch amounting to utter madness; for, practitioners being stupified with the doctrines of the Galenic, or humoral pathology,—namely, that all diseases arose from vitiated fluids, and that to cure these diseases it was only necessary sufficiently to draw off the blood and bile, etc. from the system by bleeding and purging,—proceeded to push these barbarous heroics to the greatest possible excess. The case is well put by Sir William Hamilton, page 248 of his collected works. In his article “On the revolutions in Medicine, with reference to Cullen,” he says: “In a word, as plethora and cacochymia were the two great causes of disease, their whole therapeutics were directed to change the quantity or quality of the fluids. Nor was this murderous treatment limited to the active period of disease, seven or eight annual bleedings, and as many purgations, such was the common regimen the theory prescribed to insure continuance of health: and this twofold depletion, still customary at spring and fall among the peasants of many European countries, is a remnant of the once usual practice. In Spain every village has even now its Sangrador, whose only cast of surgery is blood-letting; and he is rarely idle. The medical treatment of Louis XIII. may be quoted as a specimen of the humoral therapeutics: within a single year this theory inflicted on that unfortunate monarch above a hundred cathartics, and more than forty bleedings. During the fifteen centuries of humoralism, how many millions of lives did medicine cost mankind?”

Prior to the days of Hahnemann was the discovery of *percussion* given to the world, by Avenbruggen, in the year 1761; and, subsequently to the days of Hahnemann, the discovery by Laennec of auscultation—two discoveries in themselves most important and satisfactory, and for the purposes of diagnosis most essential. But that they have to any considerable extent advanced the art of *healing* I very much question; while I seriously believe that from their excessive use, especially in those hospitals which are attached to schools of medicine, they have

not only considerably retarded the progress of that art, but have even increased the ratio of mortality: first, by an over-estimate of their importance, to the neglect of better means of cure; and, secondly, by that hurtful exposure, etc. of the suffering patient, which the excessive use of auscultation and percussion unavoidably inflicts.

Cotemporarily with, and greatly as a consequence of, these two last-named discoveries, has arisen what is called the “Pathological School,” but which would be more aptly termed the school of the *Sectio Cadaverists*, or cutters up of the bodies of the dead. Post-mortem examinations are often very interesting, not only in a scientific point of view to the physician, but occasionally as a source of some satisfaction to the relatives of the deceased, and are unfortunately sometimes necessary to the right administration of the law; but I know of few sights more lamentable, and, if it were not for the solemnity of the occasion, more absurd than the usual post-mortem examinations at our hospitals. The room is filled with doctors and students, and every organ is carefully weighed, and every speck of morbid deposit carefully chronicled, as if by such facts the hidden secrets of nature were to be unfolded, and the art of healing perfected!

No one can be a good physician and yet ignorant of anatomy, both normal and abnormal; but to be interested more in the *autopatic** than in the *therapeutic*† treatment of men seems an absurd mockery; as if by thus dissecting the bodies of the dead we could save the living, or as if morbid deposits could ever reveal to us the deep mystery of life!

Just in proportion as the so-called “Pathological School” has flourished, has the interest in therapeutics declined; until at last a total scepticism in the art of *healing* has apparently arisen, and he is esteemed among his professional brethren the most learned and profound practitioner, not who is the most successful in treating his patients, but who is most learned in stethoscopes, microscopes, and morbid deposits; while it is by no means unusual at our great schools of medicine for the clinical teacher,

* Αυτοψια, *inspection* (of dead bodies).

† Θεραπευτικός, *curative*.

after an hour's lecture on the history of the patient while living, and the history of his autopsy when dead, to wind up with words like these:—"Now, gentlemen, *just one word* upon the *medical treatment* of this case."

This indifference to treatment was indeed but a natural revulsion from the excessive treatment we have spoken of; but from out of the midst of such excessive treatment on the one hand, and a total scepticism on the other, arose the greatest reformer and regenerator of medicine who ever lived, Samuel Hahnemann.

Born at Meissen, in Saxony, in the year 1755, Hahnemann, at the mature age of forty-one years, gave to the world, in the year 1796, the first outlines of his system, in an essay called "A New Principle for ascertaining the Remedial Powers of Medicinal Substances." In this essay he announces the first idea of the law *Similia similibus curantur*; that is, he showed that diseases should not, as of old, be treated by violently opposing drugs, but by the mildly aiding power of those medicines which, if taken by the healthy man, would produce diseases similar in their symptoms to the diseases to be treated.

Homœopathy,* as this method of treatment was called, did not at first embrace the question of the infinitesimal dose. This was engrafted upon homœopathy after Hahnemann had discovered by experiments that the dose might be reduced to an extraordinary degree, and yet retain its active powers; and he appears to have been led to make these experiments in lessening the dose, partly in order to avoid giving a greater dose than was necessary, and partly also in order that he might put his medicines beyond the reach of chemical tests: for the apothecaries had begun to prosecute him for vending his own drugs without a license; a practice he resorted to in order to secure the purity of the medicines he prescribed. Thus it was that the blind persecution of intolerant men led to the establishment of one of the most extraordinary and interesting facts in medicine, namely, the power of the *infinitesimal* dose; opening

* Ομοιος, *like*; παθος, *disease*.

our minds to a deeper contemplation of the nature and powers of matter, and surrounding us with regions of the wonderful more than had hitherto been dreamed of in our mechanical philosophy.

Thus it is that the history of medicine has, as it were, completed her circuit: for, as we have seen, the practice of physic consisted, at first, in the exercise of *faith* only; then, of specific medicines and hygienic means; thirdly, of profuse drugging and bleeding on the one hand, and scepticism on the other; and, lastly, medicine has returned to a system of specifics, administered in doses of such *refinement* in quantity as to be almost metaphysical.

The theory which Hahnemann offers in explanation of the curative powers of medicinal substances is as follows:—"A homœopathically chosen remedy excites a medicinal disease somewhat greater in degree than the natural disease, so that the natural morbid affection can no longer act upon the vital force, which thus freed from the natural disease has now only the somewhat stronger medicinal morbid affection to contend with, against which it now directs its entire energy, and which it soon overpowers; whereby the vital force is liberated and enabled to return to the normal standard of health and to its proper function" (*Organon*, Dudgeon's Translation, pp. 41, 42). He expresses much the same idea at p. 127, where he says:—"The medical disease is, as it were, pushed into the place of the weaker, similar, natural, morbid irritations, against which the instinctive vital force, now merely medicinally diseased, is then compelled to direct an increased amount of energy; but on account of the shorter duration of the action of the medicinal potency, the vital force soon overcomes this; and as it was in the first instance relieved from the natural morbid affection, so it is now at last freed from the artificial (the medicinal) one, and hence it is enabled again to carry on healthily the vital operations of the organism."

In these two passages the explanations attempted to be conveyed seem identical; except that in the first passage Hahnemann merely says, that after the administration of the

remedy the vital force *cannot act* any longer against the natural disease; while in the second passage he attempts to explain *why* it cannot, by saying the medicinal disease is “pushed, as it were, into the place” of the natural disease.

It appears to me that this explanation is almost identical with the theory of the old school as to the action of *counter irritants*; namely, the setting up of a *new* disease in order to divert the attention of the vital energies from the existing disease. But it differs from the old plan in two essential particulars; for whereas the counter irritants of the old system are *not* applied *directly* to the seat of the disease, but generally to the external skin as near as possible to the diseased part, and are also severe and painful remedies, such as setons, issues, and blisters; the new system of counter irritation is not only mild and innocuous in its action, but, being a medicine of a searching and discriminating, that is, a specific nature, it acts upon the *identical spot* where the disease exists, and thus arrests and averts, so to speak, the attention of the morbidly employed vital force. The theory offered by Hahnemann has been a good deal canvassed by his followers; but it seems to me to be a very near approach to the truth, with this exception, that I do not believe that the medicinal disease is *stronger* than the natural disease—indeed, we know from experience that it is not; but it seems to me, as I have already said, that this new medicinal disease, by creating *a new action in the part*, directs the attention of the vital force, or irritability, from the naturally diseased action into new but temporary channels, by which process the diseased part is relieved, and from which channels the vital force returns gradually and easily into those normal channels which constitute the even and harmonious current of good health.

The possibility of a new action being thus excited by a very small dose is very aptly put by my brother, in a book recently published, called “The Philosophy of the Senses,” in which, speaking of the influence of the *minute* in nature, he says (pp. 266, 267), “The homœopathist does not call aloud, but *whispers*; nor does he take ‘the bull by the horns’” (as the old school would

do), “but by the waft of a handkerchief *turns him aside.*” But of the power of the infinitesimal dose I shall speak hereafter.

In forming an opinion on the value of any system propounded for the acceptance of mankind, it is impossible not to be influenced by our estimate of the mental and moral character of the propounder of that system; and as the testimony of an open enemy is of far more weight than that of an interested friend, I think it worth while, even at the risk of the charge of repetition *usque ad nauseam*, to give the testimony of Dr. Forbes, physician to the Royal Household and to Prince Albert, and one of the most thoroughly educated and high-minded of modern physicians. In the “British and Foreign Medical Review” for January 1846, article “Homœopathy, Allopathy, and Young Physic,” speaking of Hahnemann, Dr. Forbes says: “No careful observer of his actions, or candid reader of his writings, can hesitate for a minute to admit that he was a very extraordinary man; one whose name will descend to posterity as the exclusive excogitator and founder of an original system of medicine, as ingenious as any that have preceded it, and destined probably to be the remote if not the immediate cause of more important fundamental changes in the practice of the healing art than any propagated since the days of Galen himself. Hahnemann was undoubtedly a man of genius and a scholar; a man of indefatigable industry and undoubted energy; surpassed by few in the originality and ingenuity of his views, superior to most in having carried out his doctrines into actual and extensive practice.” What testimony could be stronger than this? And when we know the unwearied industry with which Hahnemann followed up the idea he had arrived at, especially as shown in the history of his “Provings of Medicines;” and when we reflect that he wrote and published about seventy original works on chemistry, medicine, etc., and translated twenty-four works from the English, French, Italian, and Latin languages;* and that his discovery of the protective power of

* See Dr. Dudgeon's Sketch of the Life of Hahnemann, p. 26; and Dr. Epps on Homœopathy, pp. 198, 203.

belladonna in scarletina (now almost universally acknowledged by the highest medical authorities of the old school), is of itself a sufficiently important discovery to immortalize any man; and when we further reflect on him as the founder of a sect now everywhere spreading over the four quarters of the globe, and everywhere influencing the civilized world, and stirring up the mind of the medical profession, we cannot but conclude, that for industry, perseverance, ingenuity, and influence on his professional brethren, there has been no man, since the days of Galen, who has filled so wide a space, or occupied so broad a position in our ranks. And although, from his being of an ardent nature, and often irritated to an extreme degree by the persecution of his opponents, and driven sometimes almost to the verge of despair by the obstructions thrown in his way, he may have frequently uttered himself with rashness, and written much in his “Organon” of an exaggerated and extreme character, and contrary to strict reasoning; still these are but the weaknesses inseparable from even the best enthusiasm—weaknesses soon to be forgotten before the clear shining of that influence for good which he has already had upon the practice of medicine generally, and that influence which the spread of his doctrine is destined inevitably still further to have in the world; so that we cannot but regard Samuel Hahnemann as without a single exception—I speak with the memory of Jenner before me—the very greatest benefactor of his race ever yet produced in the entire history of medicine.

As we shall afterwards see, the statistics of medical treatment demonstrate that the homœopathic mode of treatment is immensely superior to the method of the old school. The question is one, not of assertions and arguments, but of *facts*; and every homœopathist has such confidence in the superior efficacy of his remedies, that he *knows* it is for his advantage more and more to invite a rigid scrutiny from his opponents. But although every facility is offered for this scrutiny, and although homœopathists say to the old school, “Do not take my testimony, but accept these globules of belladonna, it may be, and test them for yourself,” yet the almost invariable answer is, “It is utterly

impossible that your system can be true, and therefore I shall not 'humbug' myself and others by any participation in such utter nonsense." But what is this reply but a repetition of the method of the vegetarian Brahmin, who crushed with a stone the microscope which proved to him that all his life he had been an eater of the flesh of animals; and an imitation of the learned doctors in the days of Galileo, who refused to look through the telescope lest their ignorance should be reproved.

Such, however, has not always been the conduct of the old school; for Hufeland, the great German physician, Broussais, the celebrated Parisian, the illustrious Mott of America, and our own Liston and Combe, all speak favourably of the claims of the homœopathists to the serious consideration of the profession. That the profession generally should offer a strong opposition to the homœopathists is, however, just exactly what we *à priori* could have predicted; first, because with men educated in a particular mould, and all their lives acting upon *rules* which with them have, from association if not from reasoning, become almost sacred, it is demanding more than human nature is generally capable of that they should, from being *teachers*, anew become *students*, and reverse the entire professional conduct of their lives. Secondly, not only because homœopathy being new it was therefore opposed by those of the old school, who hated innovation, but also because it was a truth which challenged more than a usual antagonism, from the *excess* with which the doctrine was preached. Thirdly, because it tended not only to throw discredit on the old school, but also tended to sap the foundation of the profits of a large proportion of their class as a *drug-selling body*.

But, as it was in the days of the Scribes and Pharisees, so it is now: the nature of man is the same in kind, although milder in degree; and to expect from the professors of the established system no opposition to a new system, is to expect more than the nature of man, or the history of opinion can warrant. All new discoveries for the benefit of the many must apparently be also, for the time, injurious to the few, and must excite their anger; and just in proportion to their power, so also their

persecuting spirit. Accordingly we find, as has been so often repeated with reference to this subject, that Galileo, at the age of seventy, was cast into prison for *proving* that the earth went round the sun. The grand discoveries of Newton were excluded from the University of Cambridge for thirty years. Columbus was first laughed at, but when the laugh was turned on the other side, he was then persecuted, and the fame of his discovery given to another. Harvey, for demonstrating the circulation of the blood, became damaged, for the time, both in reputation and in purse. Next to the discoveries of Hahnemann, the most important discovery ever made in medicine was that of vaccination, by Jenner; who, in consequence, was lampooned and vilified by the pulpit, the professional chair, and the public press. Bark was introduced into notice by the Jesuits, and being well persuaded that from them could come no good thing, the College of Physicians, in the days of the Commonwealth, fulminated anathemas against the use of bark: but Cromwell died from an ague which bark might have cured, and so, after a time, bark was established as beyond all doubt the very greatest individual addition ever made to the *Materia Medica*. Moved by the College of Physicians, the government, some two hundred years ago, declared it manslaughter to administer cantharides internally; but this drug, internally administered, is now, in the hands of the homœopathists, found to be an almost infallible specific in spasmodic stricture of the urethra. What can be more innocent than a well-boiled meally potatoe? yet even this poor potatoe was at one time not permitted to be eaten, except under the strongest protests from the greatest physicians of the day! But, as Dr. Gall says, “Opinions, which are to-day persecuted *because* they are *new*, shall one day be worshipped *because* they are *old*.” I do not wish such an alternative to happen to homœopathy; but of this I feel perfectly convinced, that it must share the fate of all great discoveries, and pass through all the stages *secundum artem*. First, it must be *pook pooked*! then reviled and persecuted; then the glory of its discovery given to another; but, lastly, and finally, its merits established and proclaimed—its illustrious founder’s name and memory revered as one of the

most distinguished of his race—and, by the united voice of mankind, its facts registered as but another grand series of truths added to the sum of human knowledge.

I am not acquainted with any book which, taking the negative side, attempts to argue the question of homœopathy in a philosophic or a true spirit. The homœopathists assert—and wide-spread statistics, to say nothing of the daily experience of hundreds of practitioners, prove the truth of the assertion—that infinitesimal doses of medicine *do act*, and that the mortality of homœopathically-treated patients afflicted with acute inflammation is generally only about five to seven per cent.; while the mortality under the heroic treatment in the old school hospitals is from twenty to thirty per cent. Here we have a distinct assertion; and what possible alternative can there be left to the old school, but either to disprove the assertion or to embrace homœopathy? But what is the method pursued by the old school, as exhibited in their organs, “The Lancet” and “The Medical Times?” Simply to make the counter assertions, that “the law *Similia similibus curantur* is absurd,” the “infinitesimal dose nonsense,” and “homœopathists a parcel of fools and quacks.”

I am well aware that many of the very highest authorities in medicine, although they do not think it incumbent upon them to declare their convictions aloud, yet privately shake their heads ominously, and say to all this noisy opposition to homœopathy, “Well, well, perhaps homœopathy is not altogether ‘the clean potatoe,’ but don’t let us make so much noise about it; for the fact is, sir, there’s more in homœopathy than we used to think.” But the great majority of the profession will not be so admonished; and how much do they not, by their repeated and yet nugatory attempts to damage homœopathy in the eyes of the public, by coroners’ inquests, absurd stories, and false statements, remind us of the conduct of the inhabitants of Philippi, as recorded in Acts, ch. xvi., where we read that, after Paul had cast the evil spirit out of the soothsaying damsel, “who brought her masters much gain,” these masters, “when they saw that the hope of their gain was gone, caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the market-place unto the rulers, and brought them

to the magistrates, saying, These men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive, being Romans."

Homœopathy, strictly speaking, has nothing to do with the size of the dose, but is embodied in the axiom, "*Similia similibus curantur*." The smallness of the dose, as we have already stated, was an after discovery, but a most interesting and important discovery it was; and I shall therefore now proceed to bring forward some arguments in answer to the assertion, that because the dose is *infinitely small*, it is therefore *infinitely weak*.

And, in the first place, I at once admit that, *à priori*, the objection is a most legitimate one; for we have always been in the habit of believing that, in medicine, *size* is the measure of power. Still, we assert, experience demonstrates the power of infinitesimal doses of medicine; and merely to meet this assertion by a counter assertion to the contrary is most unphilosophical and absurd: while with reference to the duty demanded of us as healers of the sick, to accept of every means which can benefit our patients, this contempt of an offered remedy is most evidently a wickedness, for it is our duty as men, whatever may be our private opinion of individual homœopathists, to "*prove* all things and hold fast that which is good;" and, with a late celebrated physician, to say, "Show me that which will benefit my patients, and I will adopt it;" or, with Sir Astley Cooper, "I am not to be deterred from using a *proved* remedy because people tell me it is unscientific;" or, with Hippocrates, "I am not ashamed to borrow from the meanest of mankind any hints for the cure of disease."

If then homœopathists are convinced that infinitesimal doses of medicine do act, they cannot resist this evidence of their senses on the plea that it is *impossible* that such doses *can* act; but they must endeavour to render the difficulty less; and this is readily done by an examination of those phenomena, which are everywhere known and acknowledged, concerning the power and *reality* of the *infinitely small* and imponderable in nature, of which the following are some illustrations:—

The waters of Tunbridge Wells are universally acknowledged

to have a strong influence on disease; and yet Dr. Graham (p. 146) says, that these waters contain only one part of iron in 61,000 parts of water. The celebrated Chalybeate Bath spring has a reputation for cure as wide as the world; and yet Sir C. Scudamore states, that in a pint of this water there is only the 2,000,000th part of a grain of oxide of iron.* Professor Royle states that Marsh's process can detect the 100,000th part of arsenic in a given quantity of water, while Reinsch's test can detect the 250,000th part.

Who disbelieves in the poisonous influence of the miasma of the Pontine Marshes? But who ever succeeded, by any chemical test, in demonstrating the presence of that miasma?

Cholera Morbus marches, at stated periods, from the eastern to the western hemisphere, passing over deserts and across seas, and leaves in the track of its devastations hundreds of thousands of dead men; but no *chemistry* has ever yet *proved* even the bare *existence* of this deadly enemy.

No chemistry can as yet detect any difference between the air of St. Giles and that of Ben Lomond; yet travellers are of opinion that there is *some* difference!

And so also chemistry and the microscope may fail to detect the presence of medical substances in homœopathic globules; but patients who are relieved from pain, or rescued from death by these globules, are wiser than either the microscope or chemistry.

Who doubts the power of heat, latent or expressed? Yet who ever measured its size or detected its weight? No one has ever weighed a thunderbolt; yet no one doubts that by a thunderbolt a temple may be overthrown.

Spallanzani has proved that the 2,000,000th part of a grain of the male sperm of the frog is sufficient, if applied by the point of a needle, to call the ovum into an action, by which a new *living* and instinctive, if not even a reasoning, being is *created*. Wonderful mystery! And why, then, should we deny that an equally small portion of belladonna may cure a frontal

* See Pamphlet by Dr. Guinness, p. 11.

headache? But, indeed, the mere fact that a piece of wood, or stone, or metal should be so wonderfully endowed by God as to rescue a *living man*, with an immortal soul, from death, is a mystery of so stupendous a nature, that in medicine it seems almost incongruous for any one to speak of *impossibilities*, unless, indeed, forgetting altogether the spiritual in man, he thinks only of “inert matter.”

What is the weight of the melody of the “Ranz des Vaches?” No one thinks it has any physical weight; still, on its being played—that is, on the atmosphere being put into a certain *series of vibrations*—it caused many Swiss soldiers in Napoleon’s army to fall into a fatal sickness, while hundreds, at the risk of a summary death, deserted from the ranks.

Dr. Samuel Brown states, on the authority of Sir Humphrey Davy, that “One zinc nail to every six square feet, driven into the copper sheeting of the bottom of a man-of-war, is sufficient, by altering the electric condition, to protect that coppered bottom from the action of the chlorine, iodine, and oxygen of the sea.” This zinc nail, I calculate, to be in surface, as to the surface of six square feet, but as one to ten thousand; and if so minute a surface has so great a power, I would ask why then should not an exceedingly small, if not an infinitesimal dose of belladonna protect a child from an attack of scarlet fever?

The celebrated Dr. Gregory could not eat the white of an egg, which contains an infinitely small proportion of sulphur, without his body being covered with a scarlet rash. Why then should a woman covered with some other kind of rash not be cured by an equally infinitesimal dose of arsenic?

I have heard Dr. A. T. Thompson, late professor of Materia Medica in University College, state, that half a grain of capsicum, if volatilized in a room by a burning heat, would set every one present sneezing. Now, if we suppose the room to have been twenty-two feet by eighteen, and sixteen in height, then we have 6,336 cubic feet, or 10,948,608 cubic inches; and this multiplied by *two* gives us the 21,897,216th part of a grain of capsicum existing in each cubic inch, viz., a quantity sufficient,

on coming in contact with the schneiderian membranes of those present, to cause sneezing.

In reply to the objection that it is impossible that an infinitesimal dose can act, it has been asked, "Can you tell me the amount of vaccine matter in a man which protects him for thirty years from smallpox?" The question has, I say, been often asked, but never, so far as I know, either answered or calculated, and therefore let us just see how much the vaccine amounts to.

The $\frac{1}{100}$ of a grain of vaccine is sufficient to effect a good inoculation; and a man has about thirty pounds of blood in him, or 172,800 grains $\times 100 = 17,280,000$; that is, the entire blood of a man is altered by $\frac{1}{100}$ of a grain of vaccine. But if the entire blood be altered, so must each particle of blood; and this calculation shows that each grain of the blood is so altered by the $\frac{1}{17,280,000}$ of a grain of vaccine. And this alteration, be it observed, is not only for a day, but for, say thirty years; and as the blood is being incessantly renewed, what an infinitely small amount of vaccine must be a sufficient protection at the end of thirty years!

Again, it is known that a grain of musk will scent a wardrobe for ten years, and yet be itself not diminished in size. Let us then again calculate the size of the particles of musk which are so invisible and yet so palpable. No loss of weight is found in the grain of musk. But suppose, for argument's sake, that it has lost $\frac{1}{100}$ of a grain in weight; then the calculation is, if the wardrobe be, say twelve feet broad, by eight high and two deep = 192 cubic feet, or = 330,776 cubic inches. Suppose this space of air entirely changed by ventilation every day for ten years, then we have $330,776 \times$ by 3,650 days = 1,107,332,400 cubic inches of air affected by the $\frac{1}{100}$ of a grain of musk: viz., in each cubic inch of air there is the $1,107,332,400 \times 100 = \frac{1}{733,240,000}$ of a grain of musk, which impinging on the olfactory nerves of an individual, would cause an exclamation of "Oh, what a smell of musk!" while, if the individual were of a peculiar idiosyncrasy, it might even cause vomiting.

What further need have we of proof as to *the power of the*

infinitely small in nature? or what further need of reasons in favour of the *à priori* argument as to the possibility of a healing power residing in infinitesimal doses of homœopathic medicines properly administered?

But the very fact that a large number of diseases such as measles, scarletina, typhus, erysipelas, ague, smallpox, plague, cholera, whooping-cough, etc. are caused by substances in the air, or by conditions of the air, so subtle as to be quite beyond the power of the finest chemistry or the most powerful microscopes to discover—to say nothing of hereditary diseases arising in the blood, in which, however, no known tests can discover the slightest difference from healthy blood—and that the most wonderfully powerful medicine ever known is the preventive medicine, viz., vaccination, which is yet present only in an infinitesimal quantity—all demonstrate the power of infinitely minute substances, and all seem to show that health is but the harmonious or normal action of the vital force; disease, abnormal action, *plus* or *minus*; and stagnation, death. Hence, disease is more of a dynamical character than of a *material*, in the ordinary acceptance of that word; and, therefore, so also we should suppose the remedy to reside, *not* in the *weight* or *size* of medicinal substances, but in that *internal essence* or *dynamic force* which constitutes their form and character, the power of which force is in its *vitality*, so to speak, and not, therefore, to be measured by the size or weight of the matter in which this force is hidden, and from the bondage of which matter it is freed by the pharmaceutical processes of the homœopathic chemist.

But in the objection to the infinitesimal dose, how little does the allopathist reflect that he is employing a suicidal argument; for in his own practice he often uses, that is, with reference to his patient's weight, doses of medicine infinitely minute. Professor Royle, of King's College, states, in his *Materia Medica*, that the *fiftieth* of a grain of *aconitina* has been known to prove nearly fatal to an old lady. Now suppose this old lady to have weighed *nine* stone, that is, $967,680 \text{ grains} \times 50 = 48,384,000$; that is, the old lady spoken of was nearly killed by a dose of medicine the 48,384,000th part of her own weight.

To object that the power of the infinitesimal dose is not *felt* in the process of cure, and that we have therefore no proof that it acts, should lead to our also denying that scarlet fever acts during that period of its incubation, when the patient is quite unconscious of the presence of any poison in his system. The proof that the poison is acting is the fever, which is soon developed, and the proof that the infinitesimal dose acts, is the cure of that disease in a manner more rapid than either unaided nature or ordinary drugging can effect.

But when we speak of the *infinitely small* and the *infinitely great* we use mere *words*. The telescope has revealed an infinitude of greatness above, perhaps not greater than is indicated by the microscope in the infinitude of smallness below. Size, then, is *per se* but a *word* without any measure of power. That many diseases are caused by the action of imponderables every allopathist will admit, and that these diseases are cured by the action of infinitesimal doses of medicine every homœopathist asserts: let us then accept of these two facts, both *equally* extraordinary, with that *thoughtful* wonder which is as important an element in science as in true religion, and not reject any fact in physics or in psychology, however opposed it may be to the preconceived theories of the schools.

The rule *Similia similibus curantur* may not perhaps be universal in its application, or be an absolutely true expression of the law of cure; but, at least, we know that this rule has led us to a better system of treatment, and to the discovery of a larger number of specifics than any other rule ever given. But, whatever be the explanation of the law of cure, of this at least we are certain, that those medicines which can cause peculiar diseased conditions in individual parts are exactly the remedies best fitted, in the great majority of cases, to effect cures in these same parts, when *similarly* affected by natural diseases. Of this law, which Hahnemann endeavoured to establish as universal, we have hundreds of accidental illustrations in the practice of old physic, of which the following instances are either well established, or have come within the range of my own observation or experience, in the treatment of diseases after the old method:—

Quina causes a species of intermittent fever, with heats and chills ; and it is the grand cure for intermittent fever or ague.

Tartar emetic causes irritation and inflammation of the lungs ; and it is often given as a cure in bronchitis and pneumonia.

Ipæacuanha, in some, causes difficulty of breathing ; and it often alleviates spasmodic asthma.

Musk also, in some, causes asthma ; and as an antispasmodic it is sometimes given to alleviate paroxysms of asthma.

Wine causes feverishness ; and it is almost universally given in low fevers.

Opium, in excess, causes delirium tremens ; and it often cures the delirium tremens of drunkards.

Gin, in excess, may cause diabetes and other kidney affections ; and diuretics, of which gin is one, sometimes cure affections of the kidney.

Sulphuric and other acids often cause diarrhœa ; and during the last winter there has been a great noise made in the "Lanect," etc., concerning the cure of diarrhœa by sulphuric acid.

Mercury causes a dysenteric state in the rectum ; and the grand cure of this disease, in the hands of Skada, of Vienna, is bichlorate of mercury.

Nitrate of silver has caused epileptic fits ; and it is often given as a cure for epilepsy.

Belladonna may cause a rash to come out on the skin ; but many doctors now follow Hahnemann, and cure erysipelas by belladonna.

A strong purge, and bad living, have induced a fit of the gout ; but gout has often been well treated by purging and low diet.

Oil of turpentine has often caused bleeding from the lungs and from the urethra ; and small doses of this oil cure both of these affections.

Copaiba causes an itching in and a discharge from the urethra ; and this is the universal remedy with the old school for gonorrhœa.

Strychnia, from its power of inducing spasm in the muscles,

has often caused squinting ; yet strychnia is often given successfully as a cure for squinting.

Fruit has been said to induce dysentery ; but Dr. Elliotson, in his "Practice of Physic" (p. 1057), says: "In the year 1751 a whole regiment in the south of France was nearly destroyed by dysentery. The officers purchased the entire crop of several acres of vineyards for the regiment, and not one man died from that time, nor was one attacked."

Mercury, in excess, causes ulceration of the tongue and lips ; but I heard Dr. Christison, the celebrated toxicologist, say, in his class, that he cured ulcers of the tongue by nitrate of mercury.

Arsenic in large doses causes vomiting ; and Dr. Elliotson (p. 321) says: "It is a singular circumstance that small doses of arsenic have cured intermittent vomiting ;"—singular, perhaps, to Dr. Elliotson, but not so to the homœopathist, for arsenic is one of his chief remedies for intermittent vomiting.

Arsenic sometimes causes scaly and other eruptions on the skin ; but arsenic is the great remedy for scaly diseases of the skin.

I have heard the late Dr. A. T. Thompson state, in his class, that castor oil has been known to pass from the bowels in the form of lumps of fat ; yet Dr. Elliotson (p. 1068) mentions the very extraordinary case of two patients who voided fatty stools being cured by doses of olive oil !

Tea, in excess, causes nervousness ; but in a fit of nervousness a cup of strong tea is a good remedy : tea is also said to sober down gentlemen who have over-excited themselves with wine at dinner.

Cantharides causes stricture of the urethra ; but in the hands of the homœopathist infinitesimal doses of cantharides cure spasmodic stricture of the urethra almost certainly.

Nitric acid has caused salivation and destruction of the bones of the nose ; but the nitric acid lotion is often given to cure the ulcerations caused by mercurialism.

Acids cause sweating ; and no cure existed for the sweating sickness which, in the days of Henry VIII., carried off tens of

thousands of the people, until some one tried acids, and immediately the plague was stayed.

Colehieum causes irritation of the heart; and it is given in rheumatic irritation of the heart.

Opium generally constipates the bowels; yet opium occasionally, by accident, in the hands of the allopathist, and often in the hands of the homœopathist, cures constipation.

Ipecacuanha causes vomiting; and the celebrated Dr. Simpson, of Edinburgh, as he stated in my hearing, failed to cure a case of chronic vomiting from pregnancy, until he took the advice of Dr. Arnt, a homœopathist, and gave half a grain of ipecacuanha, and so cured his patient.

A semi-putrid state of the system existed in our fleet in the days of the scurvy, owing to the excessive use of *salted* meats, etc.; and yet salt is the grand preventive of putrescence.

A condition of hyper-æsthesia was induced in the ex-royal family of France, at Claremont, about three years ago, by lead poison affecting the water they drank; and yet lead is a great cure for hyper-æsthesia with the old school.

Creosote is usually the grand cure for chronic vomiting; yet Dr. Garrod, of University College, told me that he gave it to a phthisical patient to correct the fœtor of the sputæ, but was obliged to discontinue its use because it brought on fits of severe sickness.

Acids are said to induce rheumatism; and yet there has been a very great noise made for two years back about the wonderful cures effected by lime-juice in acute rheumatism.

The hot bath often induces a feverish state; but the warm bath is the most usual remedy for feverish children.

Burns, as of the finger, are best relieved by holding the finger near the fire, or by a lotion of spirits of turpentine.

Spirits and water cause feverishness; but in the case of headache, and fever resulting from hard work and exposure to the sun's heat, a glass of spirits and water often effects a complete cure: and so also I find from experience, under the same circumstances, as after a long walk in a hot summer day, I find it best not to drink cold water, but to sip tepid water.

Arsenic is a poison which, in many ways, acts like the poison of serpents; yet Mr. Druitt, the surgeon, says, in his "Vade Mecum" (p. 143), that one-grain doses of arsenic given every half hour is the best antidote to the poisonous effects of the bite of the snake.

Stramonium, in excess, causes wild laughter; and stramonium is often given to alleviate boisterous madness.

Senna causes colicky pains; and it may cure colick.

Belladonna, in excess, often causes stricture of the throat, and a scarlet rash to appear over the body, and coma; yet physicians are now more and more, however unwillingly, giving in to Hahnemann's great discovery of the immense importance of belladonna in scarlet fever, erysipelas, sore throat, and heavy frontal headache.

Examples of the same kind might be multiplied to a great extent; but I have thought it better to confine myself either to cases which are of frequent occurrence, or to those which have come under my own immediate observation and knowledge: and I think I have presented a sufficient number of illustrations to render the law *Similia similibus curantur*, at least, strongly probable even to sceptics.

As we have thus endeavoured to show that there is no good argument against the fact of the action of infinitesimal doses of medicine, and that the law *Similia similibus curantur* is, at least, in harmony with a long list of diseases; let us now, before proceeding to the *positive* proofs derived from experience and statistics in favour of the homœopathic practice, first show what little reason there is for believing in either the theories or the practice of the old school of medicine. And,

1. The experiments of Dr. Dietl, of Vienna*—experiments which he tested in the cases of 380 patients—have *demonstrated* that, in acute inflammatory disease, the heroic measures of bleeding, tartar emetic, etc., not only do not save life, but that a fearfully greater mortality is the result than when acute inflammation, as of the lungs, is treated

* See Professor Henderson's pamphlet on "Pneumonia," etc.

merely by nature and regimen, without any drugs or active measures whatever.

2. The highest authority in scientific medicine in Britain, namely, Dr. Forbes (see p. 12), has declared that "Old medicine has come to such a pass that it cannot be worse, and must either mend or end:" and this is the sentiment not merely of an individual, but is apparently in accordance with the views of a large class of medical men both in Paris and in London, who appear to be utter sceptics in medicine, and have in consequence forsaken medicine as a system of therapeutics altogether, and have betaken themselves almost entirely to diagnosis, the stethoscope, and morbid anatomy.

3. It is common for old practitioners to say, "When I was a young man, I had twenty cures for every disease; but now I have, alas! twenty diseases to each cure." And thus it is that just in the inverse ratio as their experience in the healing art is increased, is their faith in therapeutics diminished.

4. Not only do statistics prove "heroic measures" to be greatly destructive of human life, but there is an evident barbarism in attempting to "knock down a disease," as it is called; as if disease were some "bull in a china-shop" to be knocked down, instead of a mere alteration of a subtle nature in the vital action; while the cruelty of the practices of salivating, blistering, etc., must be repugnant to the mind of every refined man; while to know, as homœopaths do, that the severest diseases can be treated not only with safety, but with the greatest success by gentle measures,—just as now-a-days, under the beneficent care of Dr. Conolly, raving madness is not treated by the lash or iron chains, as formerly, but by kind and gentle measures,—must be a source of the greatest thankfulness to every kind-hearted practitioner.

5. The practice of depletion in any except the *abnormally robust* must be most unphilosophical, for it is just a drawing away of that medium of the vital force by which only can nature attain to a recovery of health; and hence the shortness of the period of *convalescence* under homœopathic treatment compared with that under "active treatment."

6. It cannot be said that the *chemical* school of practitioners has advanced the art of cure one step ; while, by its substituting the chemistry of inorganic matter, or of effete organic products, for that *vital* chemistry of which we know almost nothing, it has imitated those shallow individuals who, finding some relationship between galvanism and life, have dethroned the Creator God, and set up that manifestation of his power, *electricity*, in his place ; while this school has also often, by its theories, overruled that *experience* which is the only safe guide in medicine.

7. The *pathological* school of practitioners having a contempt for therapeutics, has gone wider and wider aside from the practice of *healing*, and exaggerating the importance of its department, in itself, so far as it goes, most worthy of study, has gloried in the comparatively idle examination of dead flesh and morbid deposits ; as if such questioning could ever evoke the deepest secrets as to the best method of curing disease and elongating human life !

8. Although no philosophical mind can avoid theorizing and generalizing in science, or overlook the value of hypothesis, still experience must always, in medicine, be a safer guide than theories ; while the attempt to render medicine pompously scientific has led into many errors ; and therefore the expression of the old school, “ rational medicine,” should be written *apparently* rational, for all which is true in *reason* must be true in *fact*.

9. Of these errors in reasoning, what I have said (p. 7) of the murderous practices of the humoral pathologists is a striking illustration ; of which errors the following are further examples :—

10. The great law of the old school, namely, of the allopathists and antipathists, “ *Contraria contrariis curantur*,” namely, that diseases are to be cured by forcing opposite states, is seemingly true in theory, but it is false in practice ; for what would be more natural than to purge out habitually constipated bowels, if it were not that *experience* tells us that all such purging is apt but to aggravate the evil by a still more obsti-

nate constipation? What seems more natural than to give a dose of opium when a man is suffering pain?—and indeed, when by alleviating pain we may increase the chances of life, or, at least, grant some respite from pain in cases of diseases likely to prove fatal, opiates should be given—yet *experience* proves that opium does not *cure* pains, but only for the time *deadens* our sensation of them, while it injures the patient otherwise. What could be more chemical than to give chalk where there is acid in the stomach? yet *experience* shows that the usual condition of the stomach which causes this acidity is not cured by chalk. Or, in cases of diarrhœa and dysentery, what could be apparently more reasonable than to stop these drainings upon the system by *styptics*? yet *experience* shows that this is the worst treatment that can be followed in the majority of such diseases.

11. Experience shows that, in the practice “*Contraria contrariis*,” nature generally rebounds to the opposite extreme: for instance, a purge or bleeding may for a period clear the bowels and abate an inflammation; but the bowels generally rebound to a worse state of constipation, and the inflammation, although for the time relieved, is apt to rebound to a higher pitch, unless, indeed, the depletion be carried to a “knocking down” extent, when, unfortunately, nature, perhaps unable to execute this rebound, terminates the unhappy ease in death.

12. Although, doubtlessly, a blister, a seton, or an issue externally applied may relieve an internal over-action, and although a purge, acting on the rectum may determine to that extremity of the intestinal canal, and thus relieve the head, still these are, at the best, but cruel, clumsy, and coarse methods of counter-action (see page 11), compared with that which a medicine, homœopathically chosen, can effect; to say nothing of the positive danger of sloughings, erysipelas, and apoplexy, which may result from the use of setons, issues, and blisters.

13. The idea that diseases are morbid *humours*, to be neutralized, as acidity of the stomach, by alkalies, is evidently most “gross and mechanial;” for it must be perfectly evident that the *forces* in our organism are prior to the morbid humours existing there, and that therefore, to enure a state of morbid

humours, the vital *action* in the part, and not the morbid humour, must be amended. This mechanical and humoral idea is well illustrated by the vulgar notion that, on fœtid stools being procured by an active purge, the *disease* is purged out; but every practitioner knows that a brisk purge may convert a perfectly healthy state of the intestinal canal into a morbid condition producing fœtid stools.

14. Although it is possible that mercury, one of the most universal of alteratives, may alter from a state of inflammation, yet it must be at the *risk* of salivation, to an extent which may destroy the teeth and the bones of the nose, ear, and shins.

15. Of all *large* doses of medicine it may be said that they act mechanically and chemically, and may even corrode and destroy tissues, instead of dynamically amending abnormal action, as homœopathic medicines do.

16. The practice of giving compound prescriptions must tend to obscure the action of medicines, and prevent our arriving at any certainty as to the power of individual drugs.

Let us now from these reasons, urged against the usual practices in medicine, turn to the more agreeable duty of considering the advantages possessed by the homœopathic method of cure; and, indeed, these advantages might be all stated in a few words: for,

1. Experience and statistics *demonstrate* that in acute inflammations—as, for instance, in acute inflammation of the lungs, inflammation of the peritonæum, and inflammation of the bowels—the mortality in the hospitals, under the old system, is from about *twenty to thirty per cent.*, while in the homœopathic hospitals it is only from about *five to seven per cent.** If there

* For confirmation of these statements, see pp. 217, 237 of a book called “Introduction to Homœopathy,” by Drs. Drysdale and Russell. See also Dr. Routh’s “Fallacies of Homœopathy;” a work which should have been called the Fallacies of *Allopathy*, seeing that by his own tables of statistics he completely crushes himself. But the professional reader should especially consult Professor Henderson’s late pamphlet on “Pneumonia,” which it is the imperative duty of every active practitioner of the old school to read, and which I cannot conceive of any honest and thoughtful practitioner of that school reading without deep interest and concern.

did not exist one other argument in favour of homœopathy, this would be sufficient.

2. Although statistics cannot be so easily applied to chronic diseases, still experience proves to the homœopathist, that from the better principle of his treatment, and from the wider range of his remedies, he is generally much more successful than one of the old system ; and, although no man and no known system can cure all cases, still the effects produced by homœopathic treatment are frequently so wonderful as to appear what is called quite *magical*. And although I am well aware that a mere *change* will often effect cures, and that therefore we should be careful of over-estimating our success where others have failed ; still every homœopathic practitioner of experience has obtained so many and such extraordinary illustrations of the superior efficacy of the homœopathic over all other methods of treatment, as cannot fail to impress him with the wonderful power of homœopathic medicines.

3. Homœopathic medicine, dealing with infinitesimal, or at least extremely minute doses, cannot ever hurtfully interfere with the healing powers of nature ; nor can they ever cause those poisonings, especially of infants and children, which occasionally do occur, either from an error on the part of the practitioner, or a mistake on the part of the chemist making up the prescription, and chiefly with reference to opiates. Nor—and this is especially worthy of notice—can the practice of homœopathy ever produce those sad diseases *caused* by medical treatment, such as dropsies, from over blood-letting ; caries of the bones of the face, or shins or nose, and loss of teeth, from excessive mercurialism ; prolapsed uterus, or prolapsed rectum, or hæmorrhoids, which have often resulted from excessive purgation, or destruction of teeth from over-strong mineral acids ; or concretions in the colon of chalk and magnesia, from the long continuance of these earthy medicines ; or lead-coloured face from over-dosing with nitrate of silver. None of these sad occurrences, we say, can ever occur in the practice of the homœopathist.

4. The homœopathic system of medicine is opposed to all

coarse or violent treatment, as not only unnecessary, but as destructive ; and thus the feelings of the homœopathist, when he is called in to treat acute disease, are not tortured by the idea of inflicting pain in order to save life ; nor is he distracted as to when and how, and to what extent to deplete ; but, having the utmost confidence in his mild medicinal remedies, he practises that gentle and beneficent system of healing, which is so advantageous to his patient, and consolatory to his own mind.

5. From the smallness of the usual homœopathic doses, there can be no difficulty in administering them either to adults or to infants or children, nor any inducement to throw the medicines away, as is often done, and deceive the doctor ; neither can they ever derange the stomach, nor cause any other evils. And while to awaken a sleeping patient in order to administer drugs must almost in every case be injurious, the homœopathic medicine can be given even to those asleep ; a measure which may be occasionally serviceable, and without in any degree destroying that rest which is most probably salutary, or at least without causing any of those disturbances which to the sick must be generally injurious.

6. Homœopathists do not neglect or despise the study of pathology ; but they certainly consider that to dissect the bodies of the dead in order to know how to save the living, is but a low branch of medicine compared to the full study of the nature of *medicinal substances*, from which alone, not to speak of mental means, are to be evoked the mysterious secrets of the *sacred art* of curing disease and saving human life.

7. Accordingly, while the old school has certainly enriched our knowledge of morbid deposits and conditions, and thus aided us in the precision of our diagnosis ; homœopathists, on the other hand, by an extraordinary amount of labour in what is called “ proving medicine on the body in health,” have, to a most interesting degree, extended our knowledge of those powers of *curing* which the Creator has bestowed upon certain animal, vegetable, and mineral substances.

8. Homœopathy, being based entirely upon *experience*, must be continually advancing in power and certainty, and cannot

ever degenerate into such madness, as for instance we have seen, p. 7, once affected the humoral pathologists. And although, as we have already said, every high class mind must be solaced with hypothesis and generalization; yet, knowing from the history of medicine for 3,000 years how little theories have advanced the sciences of healing, homœopathists have chosen the wiser alternative of preferring *specific* to theoretic medicine.

9. Thus it is, that while the old school, becoming more and more sceptical of drugs, have forsaken therapeutics for morbid anatomy, the young school, arresting this downward tendency, have in the place of doubt substituted hope; while, with every additional experience, their faith has more and more strengthened, and the dignity of medicine has been vindicated as a *healing art*.

10. But even theoretically speaking, Homœopathy seems to me to be the highest system of medicine; for it seems so much more in accordance with our ideas of what a *healing art should be*, namely, not that which is violently opposed to nature—not a “knocking down” system—but that which is subtle and penetrating, yet kind and beneficent; not that which is coarse and mechanical, but that which is of a refined and dynamical character, suited to the subtle nature of disease and the mystery of our being.

11. The homœopathist possesses a further advantage over the old schools in the possession of many most efficient remedies which are either unknown or unemployed by them, such as bryonia, calcarea, eina, drosera, graphites, hepar sulphuris, lachesis, lycopodium, pulsatilla, sepia, silicea, and thuja.

12. The practice of homœopathy has a further advantage for the public, inasmuch as it is not only a system of successful therapeutics, but also a rigid system of hygienic medicine, and further interests itself very conspicuously as a system of preventive medicine.

13. Although in the present imperfect condition of medical science, *surgery* is not only essentially necessary, but in itself enjoys a position of great scientific advancement, still the existence

of surgery must ever be acknowledged to be but a confession of the weakness of the healing art; for surgery *cuts out* tumours, and draws out teeth, and extracts the opaque crystalline lens of the eye, and uses catheters, and trusses, and pessaries, and bandages, and for *external* manifestations of internal disease employs *local topication*, and calls this *curing* disease, which it evidently is not. But homœopathy, on the other hand, although doubtless as yet unable in all cases, still for ever looks to the dignifying of medicine by the abolition of surgery in a large number of cases now considered purely or mainly surgical; such as the cure of opacity of the cornea and crystalline lens, disease of the hip joint, white swelling of the knee, herniæ, prolapsed womb, hæmorrhoids, enlarged tonsils, prolapsed bowels, and perhaps, one day, even cancerous growths:—not that homœopathists can as yet cure all these diseases, but in them all they often produce such well marked effects, as to inspire them with the hope that such diseases are not for ever destined for the surgeon only, but may one day be *healed* by medicines, instead of being cut away by the knife, or tolerated through the aid of surgical instruments and appliances.

14. If a false diagnosis be made, the administration of drugs by the old school must be productive of positive injury; while, in the event of a false diagnosis by a homœopathist, the administration of an infinitesimal dose cannot be productive of any positive injury either to the body or the vital force.

15. Again, in many cases, where from the fear of doing more harm than good by any active interference with nature, the old school would either do nothing or give as a placebo *bread pills*; the homœopathist can with perfect safety, and generally with confidence, proceed to administer to the patient craving aid his *mild* remedies, knowing that if he fail to cure, he at least causes no injury.

16. The great saving of expense in the purchase of drugs, which the homœopathic system admits of, should be an important consideration with those benevolent individuals who now superintend the management and audit the accounts of our numerous dispensaries for the poor.

17. The practice which the homœopathic practitioner follows, of carrying his case of medicines with him, has often the advantage, that the patient is saved the trouble, risk, and expense of getting his prescription made up at the chemists; while, in some cases, relief may be afforded before the attendant leaves the house.

18. Thus the power of the infinitesimal dose is not only, as we have already said, most interesting as an abstract fact, but, as we now see, it is of great importance to the patient as a fact purely practical.

19. The practice followed by the homœopathist, of giving no *compound*, but only one medicine at a time, must tend more and more to determine the true power of individual drugs, and therefore more and more lead to certainty in the cure of disease.

20. Finally, from all these reasons, I conclude that the homœopathy is the best known system of medicine. Its advantages, however, are not so *positively* marked in those who have vitiated their constitutions by over-drugging or a dissipated life; with such, homœopathic medicines should be given in stronger doses than usual; while for the temperate, and more especially for infants and children, its advantages are many and most admirable.

I have said that the grand arguments in favour of homœopathy are based upon the experience of its *practitioners*. This experience is for *him* amply sufficient, and the quality of this experience he cannot communicate to others in any shape so tangible and striking as in the form of the relative statistics of the mortality of diseases treated according to the new and the old systems.

The statistics of the relative mortality, under different systems of treatment, of only a few diseases are attainable, namely, acute diseases. Statistics are on all subjects often sources of fallacy, not only as being often falsified, but as also admitting of much of what is called "cooking," by which, according to the manner of their arrangement, the worse is often *proved* the better! And of disease, it is a subject of so changing a nature,

and its type during different periods and in different places is so various, that the statistics of hospitals are not to be accepted as demonstrations of the *exact* amount of good or bad there may be in any given system of treatment ; for instance, measles is in Britain comparatively a trivial disease, but two years ago in the Sandwich Islands it is reported to have destroyed thousands of the people. Still the statistics of disease in the same town, and during the same period, do afford a comparatively safe guide to the formation of an opinion upon any given system of treatment ; and accordingly I now subjoin the following as being as near an approximation to the truth as can be obtained:—

HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT.				ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT.			
Pleuritis .	deaths per cent.	1½ to	3	. . .	deaths per cent.	12 to	13
Peritonitis		4 to	5			13 to	27
Dysentery		3 to	5			20 to	25
Ditto		*14					36
Pneumonia		6 to	7			20 to	24
Typhus		15				19 to	25
Cholera Morbus		10 to	30			30 to	50
Scarletina		6					12
Smallpox		8				17 to	25
All diseases		4½				†8½	

Again I repeat, that statistics, and especially the statistics of hospitals, are often insufficient to enable us to arrive with perfect correctness at the relative value of opposite modes of treatment : still the above statistics are as correct as it is possible to obtain ; and even making every allowance for contingences, they still offer for consideration a subject of the deepest interest to the profession and to the public, and such as must demand of every conscientious and thoughtful practitioner an anxious investigation. I cannot, however, suppose that in private practice the disparity is as great as at hospitals ; for in private

* These figures refer to cases treated by Mr. Kidd in Ireland during the famine of 1847. See Sampson’s book, “Truths and their Reception with Relation to Homœopathy.”

† See the works referred to at p. 30. See also the Reports of the London Fever and Smallpox Hospitals.

practice I imagine there is less activity of treatment and fewer annoyances, as from percussing, etc., than in the hospitals of the old school, and especially those attached to schools of medicine.

But I do not indiscriminately sound the praises of homœopathy, in its present state, as a system of medicine absolutely perfect; and accordingly I now subjoin a list of diseases, alphabetically arranged and classed under the following heads:—

1. Diseases in which the mild homœopathic treatment is evidently *vastly* superior to the usual method of treatment.

2. Diseases in which the homœopathic treatment is still *evidently superior* to the old system, though not in so marked a degree.

3. Diseases in which both systems are, with regard to treatment, probably upon a par.

4. Diseases in which Hahnemannism (not Homœopathy) is inferior in success to the old system.

First. Diseases in which the homœopathic treatment is evidently greatly more successful than the usual method of treatment:—

Abortion, tendency to.	Head-aches, especially in forehead.
Apoplexy, tendency to.	Heart, inflammation of.
After Pains.	Heartburn.
Bladder, inflammation of.	Hip-joint, incipient disease of.
Bowels, inflammation of.	Hooping-cough.
Brain, inflammation of.	Inflammations, all acute kinds of.
Children, almost all diseases of.	Influenza.
Cholera, English.	Lungs, inflammation of.
Cholera Morbus.	Measles.
Coughs.	Mumps.
Cramps, tendency to.	Neuralgia, or tic.
Croup.	Palpitations of Heart.
Diarrhœa.	Peritonitis.
Dysentery.	Piles.
Dyspepsia.	Pleurisy.
Ear-ache.	Scarlet Fever.
Ear, inflammation of.	Smallpox.
Eye, inflammation of.	Stomach, inflammation of.
Erysipelas.	Sweats, morbid.
Fevers, all kinds of.	Teething, ill effects of.

Throat, inflammation of.
 Thrush, of infants.
 Tonsils, inflammation of.
 Tooth-ache.
 Typhus Fever.

Water in the Head, tendency to.
 Urine, retention of, from spasm.
 Urine, incontinence of.
 Urine, difficulty of making.
 Vomiting, tendency to.

Secondly. Diseases in which the homœopathic treatment is still evidently superior to the old system, but not in so marked a degree:—

Angina Pectoris.
 Apoplexy, a fit of.
 Asthma, if spasmodic.
 Bleeding from Nose.
 Bleeding from Lungs.
 Bleeding from Stomach & Bowels.
 Caries of Bones.
 Catarrhs, if treated early.
 Consumption; amendment of the cough, sickness, and weak digestion which accompany it.
 Convulsions, tendency to.
 Colic.
 Concussion of Brain.
 Constipation.
 Deafness.
 Diabetes.
 Dropsy, after Scarlet Fever.
 Ear, discharges from.
 Flatulence.
 Glands, diseases of.
 Gout.
 Gravel.
 Gum-boil.
 Hernia.
 Jaundice, from functional derangement of the Liver.
 Hypochondriasis.
 Impotence.

Insanity.
 Kidney, affections of the.
 Liver, derangements of.
 Lumbago.
 Mammæ, affections of.
 Menstruation, difficulties of.
 Menstruation, profuse.
 Mortification (as of the toes).
 Paralysis.
 Periostitis.
 Polypi of Nose, etc.
 Prolapsus Ani.
 Prolapsus Uteri.
 Prostate Gland, inflammation of.
 Purpura, Hæmorrhagica.
 Rhagades, or sores at Anus.
 Scrofulous disease of Bowels and Glands.
 Sight, weakness of, from stomach complaint, excess, debility, or dimness of the corniæ or lens.
 Skin, scaly & eruptive, diseases of.
 Suppurating sores.
 Testes, inflammation of.
 Tumours, many kinds of.
 Ulcers (as of legs).
 Whitlow.
 Womb, inflammation of.

Thirdly. Diseases in which both systems are, with regard to success in treatment, probably upon a par:—

Ague, a moderate attack of.
 Bones, softening of.
 Cancer.
 Catalepsy.
 Dropsy, from Organic Disease.
 Epilepsy.
 Fistula in perinæo.
 Flooding.
 Hysteria.
 Itch.

Leucorrhœa.
 Menstruation, absence of.
 Phlagmasia Dolens.
 Ptyalism, from Mercury.
 Rheumatism.
 Scurvy.
 Spinal Disease.
 Water in the Chest.
 Womb, ulceration of.

Fourthly. Diseases which are not so well treated by what is called Hahnemannism, but are best treated as follows:—

Anæmia, or paleness of skin, from thin white blood, is best treated by palpable doses of iron or iron waters.

Syphilitic affections are best treated by local as well as general medication.

Ague, if a severe attack, is best cut short by palpable doses of quina.

Delirium Tremens of drunkards I believe to be best treated with full doses of opium.

Although by the above analysis it is confessed that homœopathy, in its present state, is not superior to the old system in *every* disease, while in a very few affections the old system is acknowledged to be superior to rigid Hahnemannism; still it will be seen at a glance that the advantages are very greatly in favour of homœopathy, not only in its superior powers in the great majority of diseases, but in its decidedly superior powers in all those acute inflammations which threaten life.

Of course, when I speak of the relative advantages of the homœopathic method of cure, I include all those accessories which all systems of medicine equally inculcate the use of—such as chemical and other antidotes in cases of poisoning; full doses of opiates when excessive pain is endangering life; wine, in the great debility succeeding the active stage of fevers; enemata of warm or cold water in certain conditions of the bowels; the use of the hot, warm, and cold bath, and the judicious application of heat or cold, according to circumstances; cod liver oil, dieting, and change of air. And while a tendency

to spasmodic complaints is best treated by exceedingly small doses, yet a *fit* of spasms is often treated most successfully by a large dose. Lastly, although in our days, and especially in large towns, the necessity for blood-letting is extremely rare ; still I can as easily suppose a plethora of blood, as I can suppose an hypertrophy of any of the tissues. So that, although the practice of cupping the plethoric, at stated intervals, is undoubtedly a pernicious custom, still occasions may arise when such individuals may be bled, if an immediate relief is imperatively necessary.

From the above description, it will be seen that I am not one of those who speak of Hahnemannism as an utterly perfect system of medicine ; and, indeed, it would be a strange thing if one man should have brought that science and art to perfection, while the united efforts of men for 4,000 years had been spent in vain. There exists the strongest arguments against all such suppositions in science ; while a careful perusal of Hahnemann's chief work, the "Organon of Medicine," must convince any one, that although the writer was a man of great genius, he was yet, from the adverse circumstances which surrounded him, as well as from his own character, liable to pass into extremes both of expression and of practice. I speak of this because it is often urged against the homœopathists, that they despise the accumulated wisdom of 4,000 years in the healing art ; but this accusation by no means applies to the true homœopathist. We revere the wisdom, and the industry, and the genius of all the great names in the history of medicine, and accept with gratitude all which has been done for us in anatomy, physiology, pathology, and chemistry ; but we certainly reject the great majority of mere theories in medicine, and believe that the importance of "morbid anatomy" has been over-estimated. Of the manner of teaching the *Materia Medica* in our schools, we also believe, that although it is a good method for the compounders and venders of drugs, and for those whose business it may be to test the adulterations and impurities of drugs ; still it is the very worst method for the physician, who has almost nothing to do with the buying, and

selling, and testing of drugs, but everything to do with their action and powers. And yet, strange to say, this branch, namely, the *physiological action of medicinal substances*—by far the most interesting department of the *Materia Medica*, and indeed the very basis of medicine as a *healing art*—is, comparatively speaking, neglected and overlooked.

But although Hahnemann was fallible, still, as Dr. Forbes has said (p. 12), “he is probably destined, at no very distant day, to make a total change in the aspect of the medical world.” This prediction is being daily fulfilled; for practitioners of the old school are more and more having their eyes opened to the conviction that hitherto they have too much attempted to set nature aside by the substitution of “strong measures;” so that the practice of the old school is very different to-day from what it was fifty, or indeed twenty, years ago. And it is further both amusing and instructive to read in the columns of the “*Lancet*,” and other medical periodicals, almost weekly accounts of remedies vaunted as *quite new* in their application, and very wonderful in their powers, while all the time homœopathists have been in the quiet possession of them for half a century!

It is often said “Homœopathy is, like other quackery, destined to flourish for a time upon the credulity of the ignorant and the capricious; and then, like other quackery, is destined to sink into contempt.” But this is but the expression of a *wish*, not in any degree likely to become a fact; for the history of homœopathy differs from that of all quackery in this, that its extension has not been sudden, but gradual; not fluctuating, but steadfast; and not abetted by the ignorant and the capricious, but supported by the best educated and most thoughtful of our community. It embraces in its ranks many of the first men in Europe and America; while in the list of its advocates are names such as Archbishop Whately and Chevalier Bunsen; and as its patrons it has the Duchess of Cambridge; the Dukes of Wellington and Beaufort, and late of Hamilton; the Marquisses of Westminster, Anglesey, Worcester, etc.; Lords Lindsay, Grosvenor, Ellesmere, Sydney, Chesterfield, Albemarle, Shrewsbury, Grey, Wilton, Evelyn, etc.

It is supported by the Court of St. Petersburg ; it is patronized by the King of Prussia, who is about to establish a chair of homœopathy in the University of Berlin ; it is favoured by the Emperor of Austria ; it is protected by the Courts of Holland, Spain, and Denmark ; and, finally, in the State of Pennsylvania, there is a chartered college with its professors of Homœopathy, and its powers of granting the degree of M. D. We know, indeed, that the non-professional are not the best judges of the fitness of any theory in scientific medicine ; still, kings and lords, as well as commons, and Queens as well as other women who are mothers, are perfectly fit judges of what they, from experience and observation, believe to be the best method of treatment for themselves and their children.

No ; homœopathy is extending, not because it is *new*, but because it is *true* ; and if there is any one fact of a kind not purely mathematical, which is capable of proof, it is the fact that homœopathy *is* true ;—and as of all truth we can safely predict that, from its very essence, it must be imperishable, and must ultimately prevail ; so we can safely predict of homœopathy, that it must continue more and more to establish itself, until it occupy that high and vital position in the civilized world which it is inevitably destined to attain.

There are many high and noble-minded men in the ranks of every school of medicine ; still it must be confessed that the *manner* of the opposition which homœopathy has met with, has been most undignified and most unphilosophical. That homœopathy, uttered after the extreme manner of some of its followers, should have repelled the more scientific of the old school is no more than might have been anticipated ; while, that homœopathy which is “stealing,” as it is called, the bread from the regular practitioner, should be therefore violently opposed by the mass of the profession, is just what every man, from his knowledge of human nature should expect : but that no native of Great Britain, and an allopathist occupying a high position in the medical world, should ever yet have published, for the benefit of the profession, the results of a scientific and experimental inquiry into the claims of homœopathy, is much to be

deplored. The mere dogmatism, and anger, and sneering of the usual criticisms must tend only to widen difficulties and hinder the progress of truth. Homœopathy is not to be laughed down; nor is it to be *put down* by coroners' inquests and jury trials, as attempted in the cases of Mr. Pearce, Dr. Currie, and Mr. Jones. And *apropos* of coroners' inquests, seeing that Dr. Dietl, of Vienna, has *demonstrated* that *no treatment* is less destructive than *active* treatment, as in pneumonia, why should the homœopathists not bring jury trials against all doctors in whose hands pneumonic cases have died, after *active* treatment? The question is not one of joke, but of sober earnestness, which no active practitioner, if a thoughtful and humane man, can avoid pondering.

But although homœopathy is rapidly spreading, and would thus seem to offer a better chance of success to the young practitioner than the old system, yet it is necessary I should here state that neither in homœopathy nor in any other system is there any royal road to success. In provincial towns, where no homœopathic practitioner is established, there is often a fair chance of success to an active and well-conducted homœopathic practitioner; but the demand has been hitherto pretty easily supplied, and indeed sometimes supplied to an extent incompatible with individual success. I think it the more necessary to offer this caution, lest any young man should, from interested motives, be thinking of joining the homœopathists; or lest others should be thinking of turning their attention towards the study of medicine, on the belief that by practising homœopathy, success in life is inevitable. But not only are the embracing of homœopathy and success as a homœopathic practitioner two perfectly distinct questions, but the homœopathist suffers in many ways; for he is either excluded from certain scientific societies, or, if admitted, finds his position far from being comfortable; while, of course, none of those advantageous berths, such as surgeonships, etc. at our dispensaries, or teachers at our medical schools,—so much coveted, not only from the position they give, but also for their emoluments,—are open to the homœopathist. On the continent, indeed, where science is

studied for its own sake, and not, as too often in England, made a mere occasion for *eliquescism*, the allopathist and the homœopathist consent to discuss medicine as freely as they do chemistry; but our British school has not yet learned this wise Catholicity, although doubtless the time is coming when that exclusiveness and self-sufficiency—the characteristics of *John Bull*—must become less marked.

But not only may the practice of homœopathy fail to enrich all its practitioners, but the spread of homœopathy must ultimately tend greatly to reduce the amount expended by the public upon the medical profession as a class; not only because homœopathy being a better system than the old, it must therefore be a cheaper system, but also because the spread of homœopathy has set people to the study of the attainment of health by a right conduct of their lives, and by *doctoring* themselves in many of those minor ailments for which formerly they sent for the apothecary. Disease, or at least decay and death, are the lot of all men; still as we advance in our knowledge of the laws of God, and in our willingness to obey these laws, diseases must become diminished in number and in intensity, and the period of decay and death be retarded. But just exactly in the ratio of this progress towards knowledge and goodness, must the medical profession as a money-making business decline. Sanatory reforms must further contribute to this end; and although the injury of a class must generally be a painful consideration, still it would seem to be but an inevitable result of all progress, that the few should, for a time, suffer for the many.

Although, then, we believe that as science advances, so must the money expended upon medical men be diminished, still to that young man whose ambition is more for the *seven times refined gold of good deeds and scientific truth* than for the mere accumulation of *baser metal*, I would say, that there is no profession more noble than that of medicine; for it has as its *prototype* “the Chief Physician,” the *Healer* of the *bodies* as well as of the souls of men, while its aims and aspirations are the alleviation of human suffering, the increasing of human strength and beauty, and the prolongation of human life.

Hahnemann, we observe in conclusion, is destined to exercise a more important influence on the profession than any other man who ever arose in the history of medicine. Of the old school, I feel quite convinced that they will ultimately confess that they have too much neglected the minute study of therapeutics, and too much over-estimated the value of morbid anatomy, and placed over-confidence in theories and in the active treatment of acute disease. The old school will also at last confess that the infinitesimal dose is not a subject for ridicule, but that it possesses real and active powers, and that if the expression *Similia similibus curantur* be not a *law* of universal application, it has yet as a *formula* been of very great importance in leading to the establishment of so large a number of *specifics*;—for homœopathy is, virtually, *specific medicines administered in small doses*. But while the old school, I fully believe, will thus ultimately confess to all the main truths in homœopathy, the homœopathic practitioners must on their part confess, that if they would occupy a position not only of present success but of undying honours, they must, besides the study of medicine as a practical art, study also carefully, and with earnestness, medicine in its relation to physiology, pathology, and chemistry; not because the study of these sciences has as yet very much added to our success in curing diseases, but because *in themselves* they are deeply interesting, and move the mind towards the profitable contemplation of that most deeply interesting of all sciences—*the science of the mind and life of man!*

